J Mede

Scanned

PP727

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

No. XXXVIII.—JANUARY.

"NOT THE WISDOM OF THIS WORLD."—1 COR. II. 6.

LONDON:
JAMES NISBET AND CO., 21 BERNERS STREET.
1858.

BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

THE QUARTERLY

JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

APRIL 1858.

Art. I.—JOSEPH MEDE.

"A SUBLIME genius has surprised the learned world with a great desideratum—*A Key to the Revelation.*" Thus wrote Bishop Hurd regarding *Joseph Mede*, whose works he had been studying; and in so writing he was just re-echoing the opinion of those who had welcomed his works when they first appeared; for Mede was looked upon, among the learned of his time, as the special reviver of the study of prophecy, and as pre-eminently successful in his investigations in that department. Some, indeed, admitted this pre-eminence with a qualification, calling him "the first Fifth-Monarchy man,"* or commending his apocalyptic writings for modesty, discretion, and learning, if only he would "forbear his millenarian fancy."† Yet all agreed in awarding him the palm of rare erudition, and still rarer sagacity and tact in opening up the prophetic records. If you visit the Inner Chapel of University College, Cambridge, you may read on his tomb a long inscription in Latin, which, playing on his name, in allusion to Gen. xli. 45, styles him "ZAPHNATH-PAANEAH *redivivus*," because, it is added, "our JOSEPH was a most felicitous interpreter of mysteries, greedily grappling with difficulties, penetrating the most

* Fuller's History of Cambridge, quoted in Brooks' Lives of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 432.

† Sir William Boswell's Letter from the Hague, 1633, in book iv. of Mede's Works.

BRITISH MUSEUM

hidden recesses of prophecy, dragging the Romish monster from his apocalyptic den, while he waved the bright torch of chronology, history, and, above all, theology."

He is not to be confounded with *Matthew Mead*, the godly and learned nonconformist pastor at Stepney, in London, whose somewhat fanciful discourse on "The Vision of the Wheels" is not so well known as his "Almost Christian." Matthew Mead exercised his ministry for fifty years or more after Joseph Mede was in the tomb. Nor is he to be confounded with *Richard Mead* (son of Matthew), a doctor of medicine, not born till 1673, and not become eminent till the end of the century. Nor, once more, is it to be supposed that *Dr Meddus*,* who gave attention to the subject of prophecy, is the Latinised name of Joseph Mede; for this Dr Samuel Meddus was one who seems to have been led to that branch of study by the "Clavis Apocalyptica;" and all we know of him is, that he was a learned man, and the personal friend of Dr Twisse.

Joseph Mede was born at Berden, in the county of Essex, in 1586. His parents were of the middle class in society, though related to Sir John Mede of Loftshall, who afterwards took considerable interest in his learned kinsman. At ten years of age, he and his father fell sick at the same time of the small-pox; and to the father it proved fatal. He seems thus to have been early cast on the care of friends. On one occasion, while still young, and attending a common school at Wethersfield, in Essex, he was taken on a visit to London; the one notable result of which journey was, that there he lighted upon Bellarmine's Hebrew Grammar, and bought it. His master at Wethersfield rather frowned on his pupil's desire to study Hebrew; but his pupil persevered in secret, and ere he left school had added a good knowledge of Hebrew to his other attainments. Sent to Christ College, Cambridge, in his sixteenth year, he enjoyed the advantage of being pupil to the well-known Puritan divine, Daniel Rogers—introduced to him, in all probability, by Richard Rogers, who was nearly forty years minister of Wethersfield.† The field opened to

* "Wood's Fasti," i. 340, calls this person James Meddous, or Medowes (Meddusius), doctor of divinity at Basil, and incorporated at Oxford in 1610. He was at one time chaplain to King James I. He was a strenuous friend of foreign Protestants. See a notice in *Notes and Queries*, for January 2, 1858.

† An incidental expression in one of his sermons (Matt. xi. 28) savours of his education among the race of Rogers. He says, that "labouring, or being weary," is not coming to Christ; it is only "the prick of the needle making way for the thread." Now, Rogers of Dedham is fond of this similitude. Speaking of this very same subject, weariness and misery: "As the needle goes before to pierce the cloth, and make way for the thread to sew it, so in

him there he entered on with intense satisfaction; nor did he fail to become distinguished among his companions. In logic, mathematics, and even anatomy, in history too and chronology, he proved his great abilities, while philology retained its place as a favourite pursuit. He was reckoned, in the course of years, to have acquired as thorough a knowledge of the Greek and Latin fathers, and of all points of ecclesiastical antiquities, as any man living; and, as one proof of his successful perseverance, it is not unworthy to be recorded, that, having (like Demosthenes) a hesitation in his utterance, painful to himself and not pleasing to others, he set himself to overcome it, and did erelong get the mastery over this infirmity.

He was chosen Fellow of Christ College, Cambridge; and there he persisted in remaining all his days, from love of study and the retirement that enabled him to prosecute his studies; so that he wrote of himself, in his latter years, "I am a private man, having no place or dignity in the Church, nor any condition nor means of living, but a poor fellowship." It was not because he was unknown, or little esteemed, that he held no higher place; it was his own determined refusal of preferment that kept him there. He twice refused to accept the office of Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, even though Archbishop Ussher not only got the offer of it for him, but also wrote a pressing letter urging him to take it. In acting thus, he resembled his friend Dr Twisse, who, for like reasons, declined the provostship of Winchester College, though it was worth much in a pecuniary point of view, and who as steadily declined a professorship, pressed on his acceptance by the University of Franeker, and afterwards by the University of Oxford. In this Mede and Twisse agreed; they were "more concerned for their beloved studies and ministerial usefulness, than the splendour and emolument of a university." And so avaricious was he of knowledge, that he did not neglect exploring the books of herbalists and florists, as well as astrologers, if perhaps he might find some precious truth out of the rubbish.*

He was so temperate, that it was said of him, "the wine which he drank at the Communion was usually more than he

this case." And again: "The law, though it work no grace, yet it makes way for it; as the needle sews not the cloth, but makes way for the thread."—*Doctrine of Faith*, pp. 67, 93.

* E. Waple, in his preface to "The Book of Revelation Paraphrased," 1693, laments that this "ornament of our Church and of the age we live in, was never able so much as to keep a horse for health." But he is scarcely right in charging this straitenedness on the neglect of those who had patronage in their gift, as is evident from the above fact.

drank all the year besides;" and, withal, he was ever cheerful and healthy. Such, too, was his charity, that one who writes a notice of his life applies George Herbert's verse to him, saying, that in Joseph Mede you might see how

—— "All worldly joys go less
To the one joy of doing kindnesses."

He never gave less than a tenth of his yearly revenue to the poor. "Such giving," said he, "is the surest way of getting." He had learned sympathy with those in straits by having himself been often straitened. Once, when he had set his heart upon purchasing an expensive mathematical work, he was seen by a richer Fellow of a neighbouring college pacing up and down in deep thought. His friend accosted him, and found he was deliberating what was his duty, for the book must cost him fifty shillings, and it was a question with his conscience "whether the taking so much money out of his purse would not be as the taking away too much blood from a weak body." His friend settled the question for him, and left him full of gratitude.

Grave and serious habitually, he was, at the same time, affable and pleasant to all who visited him; and few men have had such a delight as he in communicating to others the results of their studies. When a friend, on one occasion, after getting abundant information from him, thanked him for his benevolent readiness in pouring out to him his knowledge, some one present merrily replied, "Spare your thanks! you are not so much beholden to him for his delivering himself to you, as he is to you for listening to him." And, then, he could most patiently submit to find others not convinced by his reasonings, or differing from him. There have been few men known, of such learning, who seemed so little troubled by finding their own opinions controverted or denied. Indeed, so far from anything dogmatic or magisterial appearing in his writings, no reader can fail to be struck with his modest and unassuming way of presenting his views. And so it was in private. "What if it should so be understood?" or, "Why may it not be thus?" were his usual expressions in advancing an opinion. At the same time, he could, if occasion required, put the truth before his hearers with point, and even severity. Offended at the ambitiousness of some young preachers and fellows of colleges, who interlarded their discourses with unnecessary quotations from foreign authors and in the dead languages, he expressed his contempt for this folly by thus criticising their productions, "They savoured of as much inconsiderateness, as if shoemakers should bring shoes to be drawn on with their lasts in them." Nor was he unsuccessful in his wit, when he chose to employ that weapon. A falconer, feeding his hawk, thought to display his profound knowledge of the terms of his own art. When Mede praised the hawk, saying, "What a brave bill she has!" the falconer contemptuously corrected him: "It is a beak, sir." By and by, "What notable claws she has!" remarked Mede. "Claws, sir! they are pounces." And so, "her fine feathers" were not feathers, but "plumes;" and her "goodly tail" was a "train." In order to be innocently revenged on the falconer, he took occasion, one day soon after, in his presence, to propose a riddle. "Friend, what bird is that which hath neither bill, nor claw, nor feathers, nor tail?" The falconer was nonplussed; he had never heard of any such bird. "And now," said Mede, in telling the story, "I was even with him; for it was his own hawk, that had no bill, but a beak; no claws, but pounces; no feathers, but plumes; and no tail, but a train!"

We remarked his readiness to share with others the fruits of his reading and thought. There is something noble in this disposition, so communicative of good; but there was, besides, advantage to himself in this habit. By this means his views became more fixed and more full; they expanded in the heat of communication, and took better shape and form. A friend said of him, in reference to this feature of his character, that "his notions lay by him in good current coin, ready for use, while other learned men had theirs, at the best, in the bar and ingot, and oftener still only in the ore." He himself remarked, "Every time I am imparting them to others, it is odds but some fitter and clearer expression will casually come out of my mouth than at first came into my mind."

"*Overdoing always undoes,*" was one of his favourite maxims. But no man made better use of his time, redeeming every hour. He will close a letter thus: "But it is now three o'clock, and I have no more time." "My sizer not being come with a candle, I will transcribe a passage of Eusebius." "Now the clock strikes three; I must make an end." And you may see a wrinkle on his brow as he writes this postscript: "I had written yesterday; but partly other writing, partly *molesti homines* robbed me of my time. *Vale!*" And then he could make good use of the time he had. His friend, Sir William Boswell, said of him, "Joseph Mede discerns day before others can open their eyes." He trusted much to his memory, so that though he had early provided himself with two thick folio paper volumes for notes in the course of his reading, yet his executor found almost nothing inserted.

Brooks was scarcely right in claiming him for a Puritan, as he has done by giving him a place in his "Lives of the Puri-

tans." For Mede had some views as to ceremonies and reverence due to holy places, that savoured of a sort of superstition, and was so much of a Royalist that he could call King Charles I., "So glorious a king, that of all kings he was the first martyr." Yet, it must not be forgotten, that with all this he was most tolerant toward those who thought otherwise, and would not for the world have lent a hand to interfere with their conscientious differences. It must have been because of his tolerant disposition that he was once suspected of "looking toward Geneva." Dr Twisse, his friend, the Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, in after days, reasoned with him on those points that savoured of ecclesiastical superstition; but in regard to these, and also in regard to some of the higher Calvinistic doctrines, was content with letting his friend know how widely he differed from him. They thus understood each other, and cultivated intercourse where they could fully sympathise. Nor could they be really far asunder even as to those other matters, inasmuch as Mede was a most vigorous, fearless, and determined adversary of Popery in every form.

This reference to Twisse reminds us of one of the most pleasant incidents in Mede's calm and quiet life. We gather it from Twisse's own prefaces to two separate works of our author, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," and the English translation by Richard More, Esq., of "The Key to the Apocalypse," published five years after the author's death. This Twisse was the renowned Calvinistic defender of the truth, who (as we have already said) was selected in 1643 to be Prolocutor to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, the very year that he translated and published these pieces of Mede, with his own prefaces. Their mutual love of study was that which formed a point of sympathy; for if Mede was an eager student, Twisse was not less so; refusing preferment for this very reason, and on his death-bed, in 1645, giving utterance to the words, "Now at last I shall have leisure to follow my studies to all eternity." This learned theologian and man of God was brought into intercourse with Mede some time in the year 1629,* and scarcely had he known him ere he was attracted by his learning, critical wit, scholastic ingenuity, and frankness of character. "I found him," says Twisse, "most free in communicating his studies, right like unto the scholar in Chaucer,—

> 'Sounding in moral virtue was his speech,
> And gladly would he learn, and gladly teach.'"

On the other hand, Mede afterwards stated that one reason for his frankness towards his new friend was just this, that he found that learned man taking a deep interest in his studies, "whereas most of those with whom I was familiar were nothing inquisitive after my meditations." So lively was this impression regarding Twisse, that in 1635 he writes, that to him he willingly communicates his stores, "because you make some account of them. For in the University where I live, I know not a second man that understands anything concerning such mysteries, nor desires to be made acquainted with them. I speak not of the mystery of the *millennium only*, but of the mystery of iniquity." But we had almost omitted to mention that the immediate occasion of their acquaintance with each other was the rumour which spread abroad about Mede's opinions regarding "*the kingdom of Christ here on earth, and that some should rise a thousand years before others, and reign in that kingdom.*" It seemed wondrous strange to find this opinion of the millenaries revived. A correspondence ensued, in which the subject was fully discussed. Soon after, Mede sent Dr Twisse a Lutheran's treatise, "De Die Novissimo," printed at Hanau, in Germany. The doctor's interest in prophetic study increased, so that hearing that his friend had got sight of seven MSS., "on the Mystery of the First Resurrection," he forthwith wrote an urgent request to be allowed to peruse them. It indicates the value attached by both friends to these papers, to find Twisse promising faithfully "to restore them after he has sucked the honey out of them." "And such," he adds, "is the nature of spiritual commodities, the author will not on that account have one whit the less." All his difficulties were now solved; he fully embraced the opinion of the First Resurrection, took delight in investigating the prophetic Scriptures, and often sent Mede "divers choice pieces of the same argument," when he happened in his reading to light upon them. All the while, he scrupled not to express uncompromisingly his dissent from Mede's ideas regarding the holiness of church holidays and the like—"for which he was as zealous" (says Twisse somewhat facetiously) "as my lord of Canterbury himself, or rather more;" his error arising from not distinguishing between the moral and typical nature of the temple rites.

We may give a few extracts from Twisse's letters to Mede, shewing how highly he esteemed him, and how grateful he felt for the light he had been the means of imparting to him on the prophetic Word. They had not as yet met face to face.

"When a vein is once found, of gold and silver, it makes a man hungry and greedy to pursue it; and the kingdom of the saints goes beyond all

* It is this year, at all events, that their correspondence by letter begins.

mines and treasures. Oh how have you blessed me, and still continue to bless me with your papers! I protest unto you, your letters, your conjectures, your meditations, are the greatest jewels my study contains. . . . . . Thus, over shoes, over boots! I am run so far in your debt, and withal am so much in love with it, that I care not how deep I plunge myself thereinto. I commend me heartily unto your love, which I prize more than I can express."—*Fourth Letter to Mede.*

In his Fifth Letter he begins:—

"How exceedingly am I beholden to you, first for your pains in affording me so liberal letters, especially considering with what recreation and delight I read them; but, above all, for your love in communicating your thoughts. And I dare profess, though I have not seen your face (which I heartily desire at mine house, but I will think of preventing that suit, and first take a time to visit yourself at Cambridge), yet you cannot communicate them to one that holds them more dear. Alas! had it not been for your help, I had been to this day a stranger in the mystery of God, while all my thoughts are employed in making up the breach which these degenerate times have caused in the mystery of *God's grace.*"

It is thus the great champion of Calvinistic truth writes to his friend. The last clause in this extract refers to his great work, "The Riches of God's Love unto the Vessels of Mercy," a work prefaced by Dr Owen, who declares its author "far elevated above any possibility of his reaching the least esteem to him or his labours." Yet did he not think it unworthy of him to turn aside to refresh his spirit by prophetic inquiry. Nay, so profound is his satisfaction in his studies in this department, that again he writes to Mede (in his Seventh Letter):—

"Worthy sir, and my dear friend,—These are only to give you to understand that your packet is arrived safely in my hands; your letters, your manuscripts, two larger upon 1 Tim. iv., and the other of ὕστεροι καιροὶ, and a third less. Time will not serve me to express the content I take in them—the satisfaction you give me in your letters. I am taken with the meditation of the slavery of the creature ever since the fall of Adam, the bondage to them that are slaves of sin, and what bespeaks of better times both for the creature and for us; the passages of the form of doctrine prescribed by the Council of Nice; * the Catechism of King Edward's days; and the rest. And like enough the land of Canaan shall have pre-eminence above the rest when it comes to be the throne of Christ's kingdom; like as it was the glory of all lands when the children of Israel were brought to inherit it."

To which let us add one quotation further from his Eleventh Letter:—

"Right dear, and my right worthy friend,—This day, a little before nine, came your letter unto me. I have been of late extremely melancholic. Your letters inspire cheerfulness unto me. How am I beholden unto you for communicating unto me your treasures, which I esteem beyond the treasures of the Queen of Sheba? . . . . I protest unto you, that if I should lie in prison all days of my life, next unto the consolations of God's Spirit, your writings would most refresh me."

* The formula for the doctrine of the resurrection set forth by the Council of Nice, states: "We expect the new heavens and new earth, when the kingdom of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ appears; when, according to Daniel, 'the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom. It shall be a pure, holy earth, the land of the living, not of the dead.'" King Edward's Catechism, explaining "Thy kingdom come," states that among other things, "we pray for the ruin of Antichrist, and that Christ may reign with His saints."

The Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly was a man of mind and judgment as well as learning. None will dispute this claim. And yet see how brimful he is also of the blessed hope! His glimpses of the future Kingdom and the First Resurrection are delightful refreshment to his spirit, for calling his attention to which he seems never enough thankful to Joseph Mede.

But Mede found few who really took interest in prophetic themes. He complains, "*Mundus amat decipi magis quam doceri.*" On this account, far from obtruding his opinions on others, he tells that for twenty years he had kept some of his papers by him, shewing them to none unless when urged. Is there not much important truth in the following paragraph?—

"For the introducing and persuading a new and unfrequented truth, the choice of a seasonable time is half the work; without which a man shall sooner damnify than promote it. We see by experience what a wound sometimes a truth gets by an error in this kind. If the time, therefore, be not seasonable and likely, private communication and insinuation is most safe: public avouching is dangerous even to the cause itself, *lest it be condemned before it is understood*, and so never feasible again till that generation be gathered to their fathers, if then. A truth, therefore, not yet admitted must be urged very warily and tenderly, for fear of incurring such a dangerous prejudice by an over-potent opposition. *For the sons of men are untoward creatures, that talk much of reason, but commonly steer by another compass, as of passion, faction, or affection.*"

Impressed with such convictions, he was not the man to come rashly forward with crude imaginations. He had weighed well what he propounded, and it is he that is the author of that saying which has passed into a maxim, universally allowed and approved, that "*rashly to be the author of a false interpretation is to take God's name in vain in a high degree*" (Epistle to Twisse). And that there was weight and authority in his prophetic views was evinced by the class of men who opened up correspondence with him, after his opinions had been made public. Mr Francis Potter, Dr Meddus, Mr Henry Mason, "an ancient acquaintance of Dr Twisse," Dr Ames, Archbishop Ussher, Ludovicus de Dieu, Sir William Boswell, Testard of Blois, in France, John Dury of Leyden,—these are some of the names that occur in his correspondence. They write mainly on subjects of prophecy, chiefly referring to Popery and the kingdom of Christ during the millennium, or thousand years.

He was too much of a Royalist in his feelings; hence every approach to resistance of existing authority pained him. Often in his latter days did he express his dread of troubles coming on the nations. What would he have felt had he lived to see King Charles beheaded? What would he have felt had he even heard of the proceedings of the Presbyterians in Scotland, in the November of 1638, when they resolutely held their General Assembly, and cast down Episcopacy at one blow? His friend Twisse would no doubt fully sympathise with this assertion of the principles of scriptural liberty; but Mede would have looked on with apprehension, if not dismay. All this, however, he was spared; for in September of that year he sickened. The proper physician was absent, attending to the sick in Cambridge (the plague having broke out in the town), and so he was not promptly nor skilfully cared for. His trouble rapidly increased, and next day he breathed his last, before receiving the Lord's supper, in which he had asked those attending on him to participate with him. He was in his fifty-second year.

He lives in his Works. These have been published in different forms. The best and most complete edition is the folio of 1672, edited by Dr Worthington,* a reprint of the second edition, which appeared in 1664, with some corrections and additions.

Book I. contains all his Discourses. They are not addressed to the conscience so much as to the understanding; but they spread out the Word of God before the reader. As a specimen of his gospel-preaching, let us quote a passage from a sermon on Matt. xi. 28, 29:—"Come we, therefore, to the application. 'He that cometh unto God,' says St Paul, 'must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that seek him.' So I say that he that cometh unto Christ must believe that *He is*, and that He is *the Easer of them that seek unto Him. He that believes this sufficiently cannot but go to Christ.* You, therefore, that labour and are heavy laden with your sins, do you believe that *Christ is*, and that He *is the Easer* of them that, being weary of their sins, seek unto Him?" Again he says, as to gospel holiness:—"True it is, and nothing more true, that no works of ours in this life can abide the touchstone of God's love; and, therefore, are not able to justify us in the presence of God, but to condemn us.

* Darling's "Biblic. Encyclopædia," however, notices one defect. This edition of 1672 omits two sermons, one on Matthew v. 23, 24; the other on Joel ii. 17. We may add also, that it does not contain the interesting prefaces of Dr Twisse, prefixed by him to his edition of "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," and "The Key to the Revelation."

But it is true also, that we are therefore justified through faith in the blood and righteousness of Christ, that in Him we might do works pleasing and acceptable to Almighty God, which out of Him we could not do." The discourses in this book are fifty-three in number, and upon a vast variety of interesting topics. Sometimes a felicitous criticism is made the groundwork of the discourse, as in that on 2 Peter ii. 4, where he shews that the sinning angels are said to be "*reserved* FOR *chains of darkness*," but are not yet bound in them. Of such texts as require explanation, he has not a few for his subjects,—"The Congregation of the Dead," "Shiloh," "Zipporah," "The Rock was Christ." And even when he treats such a subject as "*Keep thy heart with all diligence*" (Prov. iv. 23), you find him diverging into interesting explanation of phrases; *e.g.* "A heart that is loyal is called a '*perfect* heart,' לֵב שָׁלֵם or תָּמִים, not perfect in respect of degrees, but perfect in respect of parts; *cor integrum*, a heart wherein no part is wholly wanting, howsoever weak and a great deal short of due proportion." He is not always exhaustive, nor satisfactory, but he is without fail fresh and suggestive. Thus, on Acts xiii. 48, he argues for the now abandoned sense, "There believed as many as had listed themselves, or were of the company of those who did hope or earnestly labour for eternal life;" forcing the words to wear an un-predestinarian look, but all unsuccessfully.

Book II. is more curious than useful. It is a collection of Discourses and Treatises "Of Churches and the Worship of God therein." To us it appears by far the least valuable of his writings.

Book III. contains his strictly Prophetic works. There is, 1. The Key to the Revelation, "Clavis et Commentationes Apocalypticæ." It was originally written in Latin, so that Continental scholars had access at once to its erudition and research, and was then translated into English. It was sent forth in 1627. Then there is, 2. "Opuscula nonnulla ad rem Apocalypticam spectantia," in English, containing hints on several points adverted to in his great work. 3. A Paraphrase and Exposition of St Peter's Second Epistle, chap. iii., wherein he replies to the objections of the "Zelotical Anti-Chiliasts" on various subjects. 4. The Apostasy of the Latter Times. In this elaborate treatise he is at pains to refute the idea that Mohammedanism is the Apostasy. He fastens the charge on the Church of Rome, and proves his allegations at great length, and with copious references to history. 5. Daniel's Weeks, with two other tracts upon Daniel. These "Two other tracts" are in Latin, the one on Daniel's Fourth Kingdom, the other

on the Revelation of Antichrist, with special reference to Daniel's numbers, chap. xii. 11, 12. These were the works that caused his name to spread abroad as the "Joseph" who was a "*Zaphnath-paaneah*," a revealer of secrets! His view of the *Synchronisms** of the Apocalypse was that specially which engaged the attention of many, and originated a correspondence between him and several learned friends.

We cannot find space to analyse his work on the Apocalypse at present. One of its first-fruits was a diatribe by Lawenus, entitled "*Danielis Laweni stricturæ in Clavem Apocalypticam*," which drew forth a "Josephi Medi responsio." Then Mr Hayn, of Christ Church parish, London, propounded to him queries and difficulties regarding his scheme; and Ludovicus de Dieu transmitted to him a Latin epistle containing his "Animadversions." A friend, Mr Wood, drew from him an exposition and defence of other points; so that he had plenty of work in hand.† But how kindly in his style! his pen is not dipt in gall, even when opposed. And thus he writes:—

> "*Retegat Deus oculos utriusque nostrûm, ut intueamur mirabilia ejus!* Mr Wood, I received your last, doubt not but with like acceptance as I did the former; which I not only keep, but use to read over five or six times at least. And although I always assent not, yet I am always bettered by them, either to strengthen what I found weaker than I took it to be, or to learn to express myself with more caution and perspicuity."

Such was his candour, his impartial search, his freedom from prejudice, and his simple desire to arrive at the truth, and not to support a theory. He is characterised by a slowness of thought, or rather by a thoughtfulness that is never hurried in its conclusions. It was in this calm, candid spirit of investigation that he came to adopt the millenarian views, even while aware that the "Chiliasts" (*i. e.* those who maintain the reign of the χίλια ἔτη to be literal) were held in no honour. But once convinced of the truth of this view, he was not slow to defend it, though so far from contemplating this object in his "Key to the Apocalypse," that he tells in the preface he had published it wholly, at the first, for his friends' use and at his own expense. He shewed that it was the orthodox opinion in the ages following that of the apostles;

* It is interesting to peruse Durham's critical analysis of the Synchronisms of "*learned Mede,*" at the end of his first lecture on chap. vi., "Expos. of Revelation," when the "*Clavis*" had been about twenty years before the public.

† One of his correspondents gives an expressive title to Daniel's little horn that spoke great things—"The ruffling horn" (p. 737). Mede uses the good old English word "wight" for the *ζῶα*, living beings, of the Book of Revelation—far better than our "beasts." Some old commentators speak of them as "*the four rare wights.*"

and though such men as the Anabaptists may have added no credit to it, "yet" (as a friend of his wrote) "methinks the consent of so many great and worthy lights of the ancient primitive Church doth more honour and countenance the opinion than it can be disgraced or obscured by these late blind abettors." Mede adverted to the Jewish belief, and remarked, that "this smoke of tradition must have arisen from some fire of truth." He shewed that the second advent of Christ was properly neither before nor after the day of judgment ("dies judicii magni"), but was itself the day, "ipsa dies judicii" (Epist. 20). How simple, yet how significant is his remark on those who spiritualise Daniel xii. 1: "It is not safe to deprive the Church of those texts wherein her faith of the resurrection is builded" (Epist. 98). Archbishop Ussher commends his prophetic writings, and is no way startled at these views (Epist. 3). To his friend Twisse he remarks that there might have been a providence in allowing the Reign of the saints in the First Resurrection to be cried down in Antichrist's time, inasmuch as the idea of such reward and glory given to the saints would have been grasped at as another argument for making them mediators (Epist. 14). And Twisse, on his part, sees a providence in letting this view fall into neglect, "to take men off from fixing their thoughts too much on those days, the accomplishment of which was so far removed, while it was His purpose to *revive it in a more seasonable time, when Antichrist's kingdom should draw near its end*" (Epist. 13).

But let us pass to a close. Book IV. is perhaps the most interesting book of "the works of the pious and profoundly learned Joseph Mede." It is a collection of ninety-eight Letters that passed between him and his friends. Some of these contain very important matter; *e. g.* Epist. 8, to Mr Hayn, wherein he shews that the prophecy in Daniel of the Four Kingdoms is the A B C of prophecy.* Occasionally is intermixed some notices of passing events, as when writing to Archbishop Ussher he says, "I am exceedingly sorry for the death of *Buxtorf* and *Amama*, especially the latter, as being but new *in flore*, and one that had a natural genius to enlighten the text of Scripture." Another, a Mr Osbourn, proposes certain "*Quære's*," which he is at pains to answer. De Dieu writes him in Latin. Sir William Boswell, at the Hague (1633), tells the opinions entertained of his works by the learned there, highly commendatory—"if you forbear your millenarian

* It is usual to say that Daniel called the kingdoms "*beasts*," as if they were *monsters*, not men. Mede, in Epist. 12, corrects this idea by shewing that חַיָּה is simply *animal*, as in Apoc. iv. ζῶα.

fancy"—so that then, as in our day, the prejudice was strong against Chiliasm in any form. An aged gentleman of Salisbury, Mr Haydock, communicates a scheme, with an engraving. Mr Francis Potter, who wrote a book on "The Number of the Beast," sends his thoughts; and Mr Hartlet sends the comments of a learned man at Leyden, named Duneus, and several times transmits valuable suggestions and inquiries. All throughout, this Book of Letters is most valuable, shewing transparent candour, and frankness, and good temper, along with real learning and thought. But they must be read to be rightly appreciated. We give only one further extract from them, and it is Mede's reply to Mr Eastwick of Warkton, who proposed a difficulty as to how such things could be, and seemed to hang his belief of the doctrine on the possibility of understanding the manner. Mede enters on some explanation, but at the same time justly says:—"You would bring me to express myself *de modo* before you were persuaded *de re*. But soft you there! I like not that method." And yet is not this method of Mr Eastwick's the very way to this hour in which many are prevented coming to a decided opinion as to the time of Christ's Second Advent? They must first know *how* to explain all the details ere they will admit the *fact* of its being premillennial. "Soft you there! I like not this method," would be Mede's most reasonable reply.

We cannot but think that the most remarkable quality of Mede's writings is their *suggestiveness*. It is not that they decide or exhaust a subject; it is rather that they cause the reader to think, and give him aids to reflection. We doubt if another instance can be found of a man, equally learned, so free from dogmatism, so little anxious to press his own views, who yet has had such extensive influence on others. He was a man of prayer; and this may be one reason for his influence over others. He was prayed for by his friends,* and the Hearer of prayer has used Writings for which prayer was offered. It is singular to find one so honoured who, in true modesty and humility, could say, "There are few men living who are less troubled to see others differ in opinion from them than I am: whether it be a vice or virtue, I know not;" and who could declare, in the simplicity of his heart, "I never found myself prone to change my hearty affections to any one for

* "I shall heartily desire God to bless your labours" (Epist. 13), writes a friend. "If this one thing be my talent, though but a single one, I have sufficient wherefore continually to thank the Almighty, and to beseech Him that my husbanding thereof may be, by His gracious instinct, such as may be some occasion of further light to others" (Epist. 14): so wrote he of himself.

mere difference in opinion. It is sufficient for a man to propound his opinion with the strongest evidence and arguments he can, and so leave it. Truth will be justified of her children." In this spirit he wrote, and He, for whose glory he wrote, owned His servant.

Mede has been a singularly honoured writer; and yet, as we have said already, it is as much the suggestiveness of his discussions as his success in bringing out the conclusions he aims at, that has had such effect on his readers. He opens new veins of ore in the rock; points them out, and excites us to work them; and many have become rich in this gold, who owe all they won to the sagacity, the calm researches, and the stimulating example of Joseph Mede.

Art. II.—THE PROPHECY OF THE LORD JESUS.

FOURTH ARTICLE.

Almost all who have attempted to explain the Lord's prophecy in Matt. xxiii., xxiv., and xxv., have found difficulties, or, at least, have not succeeded in making the whole subject altogether clear to others. I am not so sanguine as to hope to make everything plain, and deeply feel that I need more light into this and other parts of prophetic truth. Still, I think, there is one fact, in connexion with this subject, which, rightly considered, will tend to illustrate our Lord's prediction, and to deliver the mind from contracted and bewildering views of this important Scripture. The point to which I refer is, that, at the time when our Lord uttered His prophecy on Olivet, there were predictions of *two* distinct sieges of Jerusalem, each laden with sorrow for the Jewish people, to be fulfilled. The first of these sieges occurred within forty years after the ascension of the Saviour, according to Luke xix. 41–44, Matt. xxii. 7; and the second will occur just before His glorious personal appearing, Zech. xiv. 1–7.

Here it will be necessary to observe, that when the disciples asked their Lord, "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the age?" we suppose they had no idea there would be two distinct sieges of Jerusalem, with a long period between them, even nearly the whole of the present dispensation, during which "the Gentiles should tread Jerusalem under foot," and "God would gather

For the chalice, whence we sip
Moisture for the parched lip,
For the board of fellowship,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the feast of love and peace,
Bidding all our sorrows cease,
Earnest of the kingdom's bliss,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the heavenly presence-bread,
On the golden table laid;
Blessed banquet for us made,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the Paschal Lamb here given,
For the loaf without the leaven,
For the manna dropt from heaven,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

Only bread and only wine
Yet to faith the solemn sign
Of the heavenly and divine!
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the words that turn our eye
To the cross of Calvary,
Bidding us in faith draw nigh,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the words that fragrance breathe,
These poor symbols underneath,
Words that His own peace bequeath,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For the words that tell of home,
Pointing us beyond the tomb,
"Do ye this until I come,"
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

Till He come, we take the bread,
Type of Him on whom we feed,
Him who liveth, and was dead!
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

Till He come, we take the cup,
As we at His table sup;
Eye and heart are lifted up!
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

For that coming, here foreshown,
For that day, to man unknown,
For the glory and the throne,
We give Thee thanks, O Lord.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

BRITISH 11 FE 71 MUSEUM

12.

NOTE: see p. 154: 6000 years ended in 1914!

THE QUARTERLY
JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

APRIL 1871.

Art. I.—THOUGHTS ABOUT DEEP THINKERS.

A discussion arose lately in a company of friends on a question of evangelical doctrine—let us say that of Substitution,—and one gentleman present, who took a prominent part in the conversation, stoutly denied, and even ridiculed, the doctrine under review, on the ground that it was quite opposed to reason and moral sense.

This gentleman seemed clever, impulsive, and very confident, skilled in the art of overwhelming an adversary by strong assertion, astonished that others could not see with his eyes, and fully satisfied that this could only be because they were very stupid.

Our rationalistic friend, for such he must be called, wound up the discussion with the remark as to one of his opponents, that it was evident he had not thought deeply on such subjects.

This individual seemed a fair specimen of the rationalistic school, at least of that feebler portion of it which we, breathing the lower atmosphere of common life, often meet.

Such persons have become enamoured of that modern literature which professes to dispose of all our old notions about God and His way of salvation. They find the fall of man denied and ridiculed, and human reason raised to the position of judge in all questions, human and divine. This is soothing to them, especially as, in an appeal to this tribunal of human reason, they perceive a likely, and certainly an agree-

BRITISH MUSEUM

tradiction in the spiritual realm, but that the defect and aberration lie in the subjective spiritual nature of man. Now this is remarkably confirmed by but one historical record (which has been thoroughly established by indubitable moral evidences), which at the same time contains, under expressions and conceptions of the physical and moral combined in wonderful harmonies, a revelation of spiritual truth which furnishes the only satisfactory explanation of the origin, preservation, and destiny of man, as well as of all else in creation, and of a complete provision for man's spiritual renovation and entrance upon the real life of his personal-spirit by spiritual union with the Living Personal God in Christ Jesus our Lord. This real spiritual life comes out in earthly experience, is manifested in a physical and moral sphere, and so far becomes a scientific fact. Its perfection is not yet, because it is still "here and now" amidst sin and spiritual death, with which it has to struggle and fight and so grow and get strong; but it awaits the promised "day of redemption," when "Christ, who is our life, shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation," when we shall "awake in His likeness," and "death and hell shall be cast into the lake of fire" (1 Cor. xv.; Eph. iv.; Col. i. 3; Heb. vi. 9, 28; xi. 20; xii.; Rev. xx. 14).

But, let cease. I should like to meet Mr Arnold face to face, and with him deliberately test the ideas he propounds by the good Word of God—he calling, if he will, upon his "universal order," and I calling upon his and my Lord and Master, the ever-present and Living Personal God, the Lord Jesus Christ, to reveal to us Himself as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Meanwhile we shall utilise Arnold's ideas, as we would Colenso's Zulu Chief, for the trial of our knowledge of, and faith in, the only-begotten and well-beloved Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ.

1870. E.

Art. III.—THE PROPHETIC TIMES.

It is reported that the Rabbins, pressed by the Christians with the seventy weeks of Daniel, and despairing of being able to silence their antagonists, uttered *ex cathedrâ* the malediction, "Cursed be he that computeth the times!" No believing student of prophecy will be so rash as this; yet many of the soberest look askance at the subject, fear to touch it themselves, and feel a strong dislike to see it touched by any one else. So much has been written upon it; facts have been so dishonestly warped, and dates have been "cooked" to fit a foregone conclusion; so many curious coincidences have been found, which have proved worthless; so many bold guesses, so many confident annunciations have been made, which events have refuted; that we are inclined to take refuge in a quiet ignoring of chronology altogether, attempting to read the prophetic symbols without the prophetic dates.

But is not this a resource of desperation? It is like deliberately putting an extinguisher over one of the constituent wicks of the lamp which God has placed in our hands to be "a light in a dark place" (2 Pet. i. 19). It is as if a mariner, who finds it difficult to square his inferences from latitude and longitude, and from the figured forms of headlands, with those deduced from soundings, should resolve to paste paper over those paragraphs in his "Sailing Directions," which speak of the latter. For are not all the prophetic times expressly given as landmarks in our sailing directions? The same unerring Wisdom that portrays the features of the terrible Little Horn of the Fourth Beast, limits his prevalence to "a time and times, and the dividing of a time." That he should endure for this determinate period, is as essential a point in the identification of him, as that he should wear out the saints. We cannot neglect the date without "reproaching the Lord." Can we imagine that the Divine Wisdom would, in revelations given "to show unto His servants things which must shortly be done," insert, here and there, sentences expressed in some unknown "tongue of angels," or written in cryptographic cyphers to which no key is afforded? There are the dates: on the pages of the gracious delineations of the future they stand out conspicuous. In some cases (Dan. viii. 13, 14; xii. 6, 7) they are replies to special inquiries of superhuman intelligences (1 Pet. i. 11, 12); and, in more than one instance (Dan. xii. 7; Rev. x. 6), they are subjects of the solemn oaths of One who bears the impress of the Son of God himself, sworn "by Him that liveth for ever and ever."

All the arguments used by students of Prophecy against its neglectors, equally apply to the study of these grand notes of time. And whatever of difficulty or failure has hitherto been felt in their solution, should only throw us, with a deeper renunciation of self, upon the faithfulness of our covenant God, upon the sympathy of our Lord Jesus, and upon the illumination of the indwelling Spirit; while we use a greater diligence in examining these divinely-chosen marks, and a wiser caution in eliminating sources of error.

May "the inspiration of the Almighty give understanding" to the writer of this article, and to every one of the readers!

SEVEN TIMES.

The first prophetic period that demands our scrutiny is one that, indeed, includes all the rest, the duration of the Times of the Gentiles. This has been considered by all our great interpreters, from Mede downward, as the fundamental datum, "the Sacred Calendar and Great Almanack of Prophecy." It was distinctly defined in Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the Great Tree (Dan. iv.); in which it was announced that Seven Times should pass over him in his bestial condition.* Supreme power on earth, which had for a while been exercised in the Theocracy (of which the Davidic kingdom was a phase), had been already removed from Israel, and allowed to pass to Gentiles: from divine it had become, and was to continue, bestial. All the successive kingdoms, mainly at that time future, represented by so many wild beasts, were to find their place within that bestial period; until at length royal dominion should return to the Lord and his Saints of the heavenlies (Dan. vii. 14, 18), and on earth to the Daughter of Jerusalem (Mic. iv. 8; Luke xxi. 24).† Thus this great period of Seven Times is not only a term of compact perfectness as a week of symbolic days, but is an era well defined in human history, by two of the most august events, the withdrawal and the restoration of Theocratic Power on earth.

The first point to be ascertained is the *terminus a quo*—this long period of 2520 years (360 × 7) is to be counted. Faber, in his elaborate and learned work,‡ somewhat curtly assumes that this must be the birth of Nebuchadnezzar, which he sets at cir. B.C. 658–646. But it seems manifest that, if this monarch did begin the period, it would be not at his birth, but at his displacing the Davidic monarchy of Judah. Considerably before this, however, the Throne of David had been subverted.

* These seven times were, of course, seven ordinary solar years, in their literal accomplishment on the king personally. He, however, is looked upon as a typical person, representing the whole course of Gentile monarchy; and the seven years *then* become symbolic. The divine use of symbolic time in symbolic prophecy, on the principle given in Ezek. iv. 1-6, is not the subject of argument in this paper. It is assumed as a postulate.

† Many interpreters consider that the same period had been announced long before by Moses (Lev. xxvi. 18, 21, 24, 28); Jehovah, with a fourfold reiteration, threatening Israel, in case of disobedience, that He will punish them *seven* times. The passage is indeed remarkable, and its coincidence with Dan. iv. is, in the original, even more exact than appears in our version; yet we do not press it, because we are not *quite* satisfied that it has a chronological force.

‡ Sac. Cal. of Proph. i. 63. This eminent author arrives at results similar to our own; but his premises appear so untenable, that the concurrence is of no value.

In the times of Ahaz and Hezekiah, the power of Assyria had been felt and acknowledged (2 Kings xvi. 7; xviii. 14); but as yet Jerusalem was protected by Jehovah, "for his own sake, and for his servant David's sake" (xix. 34). But in Manasseh's reign the judgment could no longer be averted. "The line of Samaria" was now to be stretched over Jerusalem (xxi. 12–15); and the House of David was carried captive to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11). It is true that, after a while, the guilty but penitent king was restored to his vacant throne. But this seems to have been through the somewhat contemptuous compassion of the Assyrian despot; and the few years of precarious royalty that were yet vouchsafed to the Davidic House were but the shadow, not the reality, of independence. For Ezra and the Levites, pleading the calamities of the Jews after the Restoration (Neh. ix. 32), trace them back, not to Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, but to "the time of the kings of Assyria." And the very invasion of Nebuchadnezzar the Holy Ghost refers to the sins of Manasseh, as its procuring cause, not those of Jehoiakim or Zedekiah, in whose actual reigns the doom fell (2 Kings xxiv. 3). It was Manasseh's crimes, "which the LORD would not pardon."

If, then, we could determine the date of the captivity of Manasseh, we might, with considerable presumption of probability, fix the *terminus a quo* of the Times of the Gentiles;—the "breaking of the pride of [Judah's] power" (Lev. xxvi. 19), in connection with the threatened "seven times" punishment."

But Israel had shared with Judah in the honour of the Theocracy; in the long-continued apostacy; in the solemn threatening; and in the punishment. We must search for the "breaking of the pride of *her* power" also. Interpreters of name* have dated the Seven Times from the captivity of Ephraim. And here, as this consummation was effected in several successive stages, spread over an era of some duration, it is well to have our fallible judgment rectified by the divine verdict of the Spirit Himself. God, by the prophet Hosea, glancing across the long period which we are investigating (Hos. i. 5, 9, 10), marks it out by its two *termini*,—the utterance to Israel of Lo-ammi, "Ye are not my people," and the yet future confession, "Ye are the sons of the living God."

For the former of these we have a distinct inspired datum; for, at the coalition of Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Samaria against Judah, the Lord God said to the quailing House of David (Isa. vii. 8), "Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be *not a people*."

* Habershon, Elliott, and others.

Now, Pekah and Ahaz were contemporary only for three years, viz., B.C. 742–739, according to Usher. Thus the Lo-ammi doom would fall between 677 and 674; and so the Times of the Gentiles ought to have ended a quarter of a century ago;—*as many expected they would.*

But, since that time, nay, within a dozen years past, ancient chronology has received a flood of light from several sources. Demetrius, a chronologer of about a century B.C., had assigned to the events of history dates lower by twenty-three years than those assigned by Ptolemy, whose canon was accepted by the moderns. But *Demetrius's accuracy has recently been confirmed* from unexpected quarters.

For a good while it has been known that there exist in the Crimea some very ancient Israelite tombs, with inscriptions on them. These have been recently examined by Russian archæologists, and a hundred and fifty epitaphs have been critically read. Very many of these are as early as the Christian Era; and they date from "Our Captivity," that is Shalmaneser's captivity of Samaria, which they set in B.C. 696; as shown by the Metarchian (or modern Jewish) computation being given in some cases. This, then, agrees nearly with Demetrius; our marginal date (2 Kings xvii.) being B.C. 721, or twenty-five years earlier.

The very valuable cuneiform document from Nineveh recently deciphered by Sir Henry Rawlinson, called by him the Assyrian Canon, has fixed the Assyrian reigns by the aid of solar eclipses; which, whenever they can be availed-of, are the most indubitable of all chronological criteria. The eclipse of June 15, 763 B.C., verified by the astronomer-royal, fixes the first year of Tiglath-pileser as 745. He records the taking of tribute from Menahem and Uzziah, whose reigns agree with this date.

The sign of the going back of the shadow on the steps (dial) of Ahaz, has been shown to have been the result of a solar eclipse. This was in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. Now there was an eclipse, which accurately meets the conditions, on the 11th of January 689; and this agrees with Demetrius's account of Sennacherib.

An eclipse recorded by Herodotus as occurring just before the fall of Nineveh, in 585, fixes the first year of Nebuchadnezzar in 582; and this is confirmed by Abydenus.*

* For the deeply interesting details of all the above data, the reader is referred to Mr Bosanquet's valuable work, "Messiah the Prince," *second edition.* He adduces other authorities from Egyptian and Armenian archives, all confirmatory of the same important facts. See also this Journal for April 1870.

Thus we may, without the least hesitation, consider the datum given by Jehovah Himself for the final breaking of Ephraim, as indubitably falling within a range 25 years later than that set in the margin of our Bible; therefore, between B.C. 652 and 649. This would be about the middle of Manasseh's reign; and probably it was in the same campaign that finally swept Samaria, that "the captains of the host of the King of Assyria took Manasseh . . . and carried him to Babylon." It is true, the sacred history has not *distinctly* recorded this final ruin of Israel,* but the Spirit of Prophecy has accurately fixed its date. Thus the Times of the Gentiles would have an appropriate commencing date, equally applicable to both Ephraim and Judah.

If this was indeed so; if the datum given (Isa. vii. 8) of the Lo-ammi state of Israel, was, indeed, in the mind of God, the *terminus a quo* of the Seven Times;—the end, when Jerusalem shall no more be trodden down, and when the kingdom, even the first dominion, shall come to her, ought to fall between the years 1868 and 1871. Whether it will, we wait to see. We affirm nothing; but here is food for hope.

It has been suggested (by Habershon and others) that these far-reaching Times were intended to bear a twofold computation: that they should have a double commencement, and therefore a double termination; the one such as may be called incipient or inchoate, the other absolute and final. Thus the Seventy Years' Captivity has been reckoned, 1st, from the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, when he took Jerusalem, and made Jehoiakim subject,—to the first year of Cyrus; 2d, from the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar, when he destroyed the city, to the second year of Darius; each of these periods comprising seventy years, but the one beginning and ending eighteen years earlier than the other.

So with respect to the great period under consideration:—while the main commencement of the 2520 years seems to be correctly assigned to B.C. 652–649, an incipient commencement may be assigned to a date about seventy-five years earlier. For the beginning of the removing of Israel out of their land was that recorded in 2 Kings xv. 29, when, "in the days of Pekah . . came Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, and took . . Gilead, and Galilee, &c., . . and carried them captive to Assyria." We have, indeed, no nearer clue to the exact date of this captivity, than that it was "in the days of Pekah," who reigned

* Unless it be in 2 Kings xvii. 23, 24. The deportation mentioned in ver. 6, falls forty-five years too early, being but twenty years after Isaiah's prediction.

from 734 to 715. It was, however, probably distinct from, and anterior to, that of the campaign against Damascus, mentioned afterwards (xvi. 9), which was *near the end* of Pekah's reign; —since no allusion is then made to Israel. If we place it, conjecturally, about the middle of Pekah's reign, or B.C. 727–724; it will be just seventy-five years earlier than the final breaking of Ephraim.

TIME, TIMES AND A HALF.

The division of time around which the history (at least, the *sacred* history) of this world revolves, is the Week. It does not, like other divisions,—the day, the month, the year,—depend, in the least, upon the motions of the heavenly bodies, but on the arbitrary choice of the Most High God. He chose so to order the progress of his creation, that, with its consequent rest, a week of time should thereby be covered; typical, as is generally thought, of a yet more august Week, of which each unit should be a thousand years. When He separated Israel to Himself, He divided their time into three series of weeks;—the week of days; the week of years; and the week of sabbatic years (Lev. xxv. 4, 8). The captivity in Babylon was ordained to be seventy years;—"that the land might enjoy its Sabbaths" (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). And the interval of restoration, the "lightening of the bondage," until Messiah the Prince, was to be seventy weeks, of which each unit should be a year.

It is in harmony with this Divine order that the great period of Seven Times be considered as another august Week, of which each unit is a symbolic year, a year of years, 360 years. And, as the closing week of the Seventy Weeks (Dan. ix. 27) was to be marked, "in the midst" of it, by a portentous darkening of recognised worship, and a calamitous uprising of impious power, so this grand Week, the Seven Times, was to be bisected; and its middle point distinctly marked by the rise of that terrible mysterious power, so often, and with so various threatening features, portrayed by the Holy Ghost,—the Antichrist. Twice to the prophet Daniel, and five times to the beloved Apostle, is the duration of this enemy limited to the latter half of the grand Week, computed, sometimes as "a time, times and a half" (*i.e.*, 3½ years); sometimes as 42 months; sometimes as 1260 days.

No computation of this period can be presumed correct, whose commencement does not bisect the 2520 years; and any that does, particularly if in both its incipient and its absolute admeasurements, most surely derives a cumulative force from that fact.

This being premised, we have to search for the date of the rise of the Papacy. Its rise, indeed, was very gradual, covering many centuries; and unless the Divine Oracles have marked some distinctive features, by which its maturity should be defined, our inquiry is futile.

In Dan. vii. 25 it is written,—"And [he] shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand, until a time and times and the dividing of time." Thus the giving of the *Saints*, or the *Laws*, or *both*, into the hand of the Horn, marks the beginning of the datum.

In Rev. xi. 2, the holy city is represented as to be trodden by the Gentiles forty and two months. In ver. 3, the witnesses for Christ prophesy in sackcloth 1260 days. In xii. 6 and 14, the persecuted heavenly woman is in the wilderness, and is nourished there, for the same period. In xiii. 5, the beast is empowered to continue [or practise, or make war] forty and two months.

Thus, then, we must ascertain at what period the *Saints* were given into the power of the Pope, whereby he began to trample underfoot the professing Church, and to make war upon, wear out, and reduce to great affliction, and to invisibility, the true Saints, the hidden Church. And, also, when the *Laws* were given into his power, so as to set him above law, and reveal him the lawless one (ὁ ἄνομος, 2 Thess. ii. 8).

Again, in Rev. xvii. 12, it is announced that the ten kings receive power as kings one hour with the beast. So the date of their emergence will shed additional light on that of his.

Who could give the Saints into any one's hand? Only he who possessed them by Divine right. But God had given into the hand of the King of Babylon, as the golden head of the Great Image (Dan. ii. 38), the children of men, dwell where they might. Now the Emperor of Rome was his lineal successor (ver. 40), and inherited his rights.

The sixth century of the Christian era saw, on the throne of the Roman world, the Emperor Justinian, whose long reign was rendered eminent by the publication of a volume of Civil Law, which was adopted, even by all the nations among which the Empire was afterwards divided. The publication occupied the greater part of his reign, including the Code in 529, the Pandects in 533, and closing with the *Novellæ Constitutiones*, the first of which appeared in 535.

Throughout these the authority of the Bishop of Rome was exalted and aggrandized; and he was constituted supreme judge in all matters of faith and heresy. In 533, the Emperor wrote

his famous decretal letter to the Pope, in which he "makes haste to subject and to unite to the See of his Holiness all the priests of the whole East [those of the West being already subject]," and declares him to be "the Head of all the holy Churches." In the Novellæ, in which many new laws were added to those already in force, jurisdiction was largely given to the ecclesiastics above the secular judges; the supreme Pontificate was said indubitably to belong to the Old Rome (Nov. 10): the decisions of the four first Councils were to be received: the first place to be given to the Pope of Rome, the second to the Patriarch of Constantinople (131). Justinian declared his obligation to see the canons observed, with the force of laws (137).

Thus, every human conscience within the Fourth Empire being subjected, under cruel penalties, to the Bishop of Rome, and his authority being thus declared paramount, the Saints and the Laws were together put into his hand, by one who alone could legally do either. And this was accomplished mainly within a period ranging from A.D. 533 to 535-6. And this was precisely 1260 years after B.C. 727-724, the date just assigned to the incipient captivity of Israel.

This, however, was but the *incipient* revelation of the Man of Sin. The power of the Emperor himself was passing away, and, in the field of the Western Empire, which was now to be the almost exclusive scene of prophetic vision, the Gothic hordes were already forming themselves into the Ten Kingdoms. For some time the majority of these, though professing Christianity, maintained a stout antagonism to the See of Rome; but soon after the commencement of the 7th century the last of them, the Goths in Spain and Italy, and the Anglo-Saxons in Britain, submitted to the Pope as their head; and so the subjection of the whole ten was accomplished. By this time, too, all the ten had assumed the diadem as the royal badge: an important note of time, as the ten-horned Beast (Rev. xiii. 1) has diadems on his *horns* at his emergence.*

At this period the Papal throne was occupied by Gregory the Great, a prelate of many admirable qualities, who ever concentrated his efforts on the aggrandizement of his See. He has been styled "the last *Bishop* of Rome,† as if after him the overseer were merged in the sovereign. He denounced in the severest terms the "scandalous profanity and blasphemy" of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had assumed the title of Universal Bishop; protesting that‡ whosoever should do so

* See Elliott's "Hor. Apoc.," part iv., ch. iv., § 2.
† Bower's "History of the Popes," ii. 715. ‡ Ibid., ii. 682.

would be the forerunner of Antichrist. A memorable verdict! For within three years after Gregory's death, namely, in 607, his successor Boniface III. obtained from the Emperor Phocas that this very title of Universal Bishop should be authoritatively withdrawn from the Patriarch of Constantinople, and transferred to himself and his successors in perpetuity. And he had no sooner acquired it than he began to act upon it with the most arrogant assumption, lording it as absolute monarch of the Church.*

This Emperor Phocas, himself one of the vilest of mankind, heaped successive favours on the Roman See, so that his reign (from A.D. 602 to 610) has been generally reckoned, by Romish as well as Protestant authorities, the epoch of the true rise of the Papacy. In 609 he conferred upon Boniface IV. the famous Pantheon, a temple which had been built in the reign of Augustus, for the worship of Cybele, "the Divine Mother," and all the gods. The Pope in the following winter† solemnly, and with great pomp, dedicated it to the worship of Mary, "the Mother of God," and all the martyrs. Thus he publicly and authoritatively adopted the Pagan idolatry, the names of the idols alone being changed.

Other important circumstances there were, which combined to fix attention to this particular juncture as a grand prophetic era. It was in A.D. 612 that Mohammed began to publicly claim the character of a prophet, and to teach that heresy which was soon to attain such vast magnitude. If the Little Horn of the Goat (Dan. viii.) signifies this power, it is observable that its scourge is provoked by *transgression* [apostacy] (ver. 12); and its rise is fixed to the period when the *transgressors* [apostates] *are come to the full* (ver. 23); expressions which seem to glance at the maturity of the foretold great apostacy of the west, which, therefore, in the Divine mind was now accomplished.

Again, the persecution of the poor broken people of Israel, by apostate Christendom, which was to reach so terrific a height, began at this very era. Hitherto the Church had exhibited towards the Jews an aspect of at least comparative moderation; but, in 610, the Emperor Heraclius in the east, and in 612, the Visigoth King Sisebut in Spain, issued edicts of the

* Bower's "History of the Popes," ii. 724.
† The actual date seems not quite certain. Boniface IV. assumed the Pontificate August 25, 608. Baronius says the dedication was on November 1; but this could hardly have been the November of 608, two months after his ascension. Platina mentions an act of this Pontiff in May *before* the dedication, which could not be earlier than May 609. Alcorn, in his Chronology, puts it in 610, but he gives no authority.

most rigorous character against the Jews, as being "the authors of all the miseries of the Empire,"* inaugurating the accomplishment of those fearful predictions to be found in Lev. xxvi. 36–39, and Deut. xxviii. 64–67.

Let us pause here for a moment, and see whereunto we have arrived. We have found reason to conclude that the Seven Times began incipently B.C. 727–724; and that the incipient rise of the Papal power took place A.D. 533–536, precisely at their bisection. But the Seven Times began absolutely and finally seventy-five years later; viz., B.C. 652–649; and we have just seen ground to assign the maturity† of the Papal power to A.D. 607–612:—again precisely at their bisection.

Can this parallelism, which must be confessed to be highly worthy of our serious regard, to say the least, be carried yet onward to the completion of the Times?

That the years with which the last century closed constituted a notable prophetic era, Presentist interpreters are nearly unanimous. Then "the judgment [on the Little Horn] began to sit, taking away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end" (Dan. vii. 26). And then flew forth the angel with "the everlasting gospel to preach . . . to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people" (Rev. xiv. 6, 7), founding his mission on the fact that the hour of God's judgment *was come.*

Now, this striking of "*the hour*" seems to point to some specific, recognised note of time; just as our Lord's phrase, at the opening of his ministry (Mark i. 15), "*the time* is fulfilled," clearly points to the famous prediction of the Seventy Weeks.

Had any notable period, then, arrived, which might be connected in the minds of devout men with the judgment of God? A moment's calculation will show that it was just 2520 years from the incipient opening of the Times of the Gentiles, B.C. 727–724; and just 1260 years from the incipient rise of the Papal power, A.D. 533–536.

Just at that very time sounded the Seventh Trumpet, the third and last Woe, comprising seven vials, in whose successive outpourings the wrath of God on the apostate Roman world should be filled up. It *was the "hour" of the first* FRENCH REVOLUTION.

Then "fell the noisome and grievous ulcer" of atheism "on the men who had the mark of the Beast;" upon France, "eldest son of the Church;" always foremost in supporting the Papacy. The dreadful outbursting of democratic fury suddenly overturned all that was most stable in civil institutions; and, full of hatred against Christianity, satiated its rage on that form of it with which alone it was familiar, the corrupt, apostate religion of Popery. After several heavy blows inflicted by the popular assemblies on the Church, such as the confiscation of all its property, the degradation, impoverishment, banishment, and slaughter of the clergy, the use of the Christian era and the Christian religion itself were publicly renounced. This was in November 1793; and it remained the law of France till Lanjuinais brought in his decree for freedom of worship in May 1795. In the following year a new power arose, and the scene of judgment shifts to the rivers and fountains of Italy.

* See Da Costa's "Israel and the Gentiles," 217.

† The maturity of its *revelation*, not the maturity of its *development*.

But this judgment on the Papacy and Papal Europe, heavy as it was, was only an *incipient* taste of the wrath of God. The epoch which ought, if these parallelisms are not delusive, to accomplish that wrath to the uttermost, is even now upon us. The seventy-five years of interval between the incipient and the complete are even now in the very act of closing. The fated years!—the august Week of symbolic Times!—the far-reaching, slow-revolving ages of Gentile dominion! are even now, unless these calculations are utterly baseless, dropping out their very last sands! We stand on the brink of a shoreless ocean, and in breathless awe ask if the events are *still* holding their even race with the times; or whether they fail at the final issue. The FINAL ISSUE is not yet come; but does not every feature of the age in which we live confirm the accuracy of the calculation, and encourage the blessed hope?

1290 AND 1335 YEARS.

The "time, times and a half," mentioned in Daniel xii. 7, must surely be the same period as we have already considered, *in its fullest and most complete* sense; because, from the question to which it is an answer, and from the event which is to mark its close,—"after the accomplishment of the dispersion of the holy people" (*Wintle's version*),—the Times of the Gentiles end with it.

But the two periods mentioned in the latter part of the same chapter,—1290 days (ver. 11), and 1335 days (ver. 12),—may not be a simple prolongation of the former; and this may be hinted by the notable change of the formula, these having a *day* for their unit, instead of a *time.* They are both confessedly obscure; but from the fact that the space by which the longer exceeds the former is exactly that of the difference between the incipient and the complete dates, viz., 75 years, we incline to accept them as intended to unite the two modes of computation.

Thus the taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of the desolating abomination, may both be taken in the *mystical* sense;—the former equivalent to the rendering of the true Church invisible (Rev. xii. 6), the latter to the revelation of the Papal apostacy. The 75 years are subdivided into periods of 30 and 45. The former of these, dated from 1792–6, brings us to the Greek Insurrection, the first fatal blow to Turkey, and the beginning of the drying of the symbolic Euphrates. The latter promises its completion; and that *imminently*, if this computation is well-grounded.

A TIME NO LONGER.

In intimate relation to this grand period of three times and a half stands the remarkable promise in Rev. x. 6, 7, "that there should be time no longer." If we do not misread the Oracle, it adds an independent and very important confirmation to the chronological conclusions at which we have just arrived. Our translation, indeed, making it signify that time itself, time in the abstract, should cease, being lost in eternity, is untenable and absurd; being contradicted by the subsequent announcement of a thousand years (xx. 4–7) to begin after the seventh trumpet has ceased. Mr Elliott ("Hor. Apoc.," 5th ed.) renders it, "the time shall no further be prolonged;" and rejects the rendering of Mr Birks and Mr Bickersteth—"a time shall not yet be," (*i.e.*, a mystic, symbolic Time, or chronological period), on the ground that "χρονος is never used in this sense, either in the LXX Version of Daniel, or in the Apocalypse; the word used in these cases being always and distinctively καιρος." Mr Elliott adds,—"Mr Birks does not appear to me to have advanced a step towards removing the gravity of this objection."

Mr Birks's arguments we have not met with; but the gravity of the objection seems, to our own judgment, greatly diminished, when we reflect that there are but *two* original occurrences of the expression, besides the one in question. For Dan. xii. 7, and also Rev. xii. 14, are, without controversy, reproductions, and (so to speak) quotations, of the original phrase in Dan. vii. 25. And so the fact will stand thus: The Holy Ghost, for a year in a symbolic sense, has twice (Dan. iv. 13 (16); and vii. 25) used the word καιρος, and once (Rev. x. 6) χρονος. But the constant use of these two words as strictly synonymous and interchangeable, both in the Scriptures and in profane authors,* helps further to remove the objection.

Nor can we overlook the very notable parallelism between

* See Wintle's "Daniel," p. 206.

the passages Dan. xii. 7, and Rev. x. 5. In the former a heavenly Man stands on the waters of the river, and, holding up his right hand and his left hand to heaven, swears by Him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time, times and a half; and then all these things shall be finished. In the latter a glorious Angel stands on the sea and on the earth, and, lifting up his hands to heaven, swears by Him that liveth for ever and ever, that there shall not be yet a time; but in the days of the seventh angel, whensoever he may have to sound, the Mystery of God shall be finished. We can hardly fail to infer the identity of meaning of the terms used for "time" in the two cases; or to conclude that, in the latter utterance, *two times and a half*, out of the three and a half of the former, had already passed away.

Now, that the historical event prefigured in Rev. x. is the glorious Reformation under Luther, has been clearly shown by Mr Elliott. Then, if these premises be accepted, we have good ground for confidence that, from A.D. 1517, there should *not* be 360 years before the consummation of the Mystery of God.

EVENING-MORNING 2300.

We will now examine a prophetic period, perhaps the most difficult of all. In Daniel's vision of the Ram and He-goat, the duration of the events foreshown is thus limited: "Unto 2300 days (lit., unto evening-morning 2300): then shall the sanctuary be cleansed (justified)."

We do not here inquire whether Rome (Pagan and Papal), or Mohammedism, be symbolized by this Little Horn; nor whether the oppressed and scandalized Church, or the Gentile-trodden land of Israel, be intended by the sanctuary. The vindication of the one and the cleansing of the other will doubtless synchronize; and it is the *chronology* that is now in question.

In the third year of Belshazzar Daniel (viii. 1) saw a vision, of which (ver. 15) he sought for the meaning. A divine voice commissions Gabriel (ver. 16) to make him understand the vision. Gabriel (vv. 20–26) explains the symbols copiously, with one exception, the symbol of the *duration*. This he expressly *shuts up*, merely telling the seer that it shall be for many days, and that it reaches to the time of the end, "the last end of the indignation." But this point, "how long?" had been the main object of holy inquiry among the angelic speakers in the seer's hearing; so that, this being still shut up, Daniel remains "astonished at the vision, no one understanding it" (ver. 27).

It is plain, then, that Gabriel had not, as yet, done what he had been commanded to do;—he had not "made the man to understand the vision."

But, in the first year of Darius (ix. 1), Daniel being occupied in confession and prayer (ver. 21), Gabriel is sent a second time to him, "the same Gabriel whom he had seen in the vision at the beginning" (as he is careful to tell us); who says, "O Daniel, I am *now* come forth to give thee skill and understanding." That is, surely, "I am now come to perform the commission entrusted to me some time ago, in thy hearing" (but which hitherto had remained incomplete, perhaps in order to educe this very spirit of humiliation and confession):—"therefore," he goes on, "understand the matter, and consider *the vision.*"

But what *vision?* No vision is mentioned as having been seen by Daniel, since that of the Ram and He-goat; and the whole of Gabriel's address shows irrefragably that it is *that vision* which he wishes to recall to the prophet's attention, before he opens his explication.

Well; the prophet opens his ears, doubtless:—we open ours too. Now, at length, he is going "to understand that vision" which so astonished him before. He is going to get a clue to the *duration* of it, surely; because this is the only part left shut up.

The revealing angel then begins a discourse; and his first word shows that its subject is chronology. "Seventy weeks are *cut-off*," &c. We listen to the end;—and what have we learned about "*the vision?*" What do we know about the evening-morning, that we did not know before? Most of us would, I fear, be constrained to reply, "Nothing!" Has Gabriel then failed a second time? Granted that we have gained some very valuable information about the proximity of Messiah; yet this is not exactly what was announced by him, when he appeared, as what he was going to give. It was *more understanding* of *that former vision.* And where is it? Was Daniel as much puzzled as we are? We certainly read no more of his mourning and astonishment; no more complaints that no one understood it. Perhaps *he* got some clue which *we* do not catch up. Possibly he reasoned somewhat thus: "Since seventy weeks are to be *cut off** before Messiah's appearing, *from* what longer period are they to be cut off? What, but the 2300 evening-morning? For no other integral period, no period from which 490 years could be cut off, has been mentioned in the previous vision, or at any other time since. If this be so, then, when once Messiah has appeared, and the concomitant circumstances have happened, the people of God will know that 490 years of the 2300 have lapsed; and thus, having the *terminus a quo*, will be able to fore-calculate the *terminus ad quem*, when the sanctuary shall be justified."

**Cut off* is the literal meaning of the word rendered *determined* in ix. 24.

The angel says, "Seventy weeks are cut off [*lit.* is cut off; as if *en masse*] over thy people and over thy holy city, to restrain apostacy, and to seal [or to bring to the full] sins . . . " These expressions appear to look onward to the period when the Jewish people and city should be given up by God, and the wrath should come upon them to the uttermost. And this was not till the beginning of the Roman war, when (A.D. 66) the believing Jews fled from Jerusalem; the son of the freewoman was finally separated from the son of the bondwoman; the salt of the nation was taken away, and the mass hastened to corruption.

How the details of the prediction are to be reconciled with this, it is not our purpose here to show. If we have succeeded in proving the connection of chaps. viii. and ix., and if the two phrases just quoted from ix. 24 carry on the seventy weeks to A.D. 66; it seems to follow (whatever difficulties we may find on other points) that the angel gives this key to the vision: that, whereas 2300 years shall bring the last end of the indignation, and 490 years cut off from it bring A.D. 66, the remaining 1810 years must be dated from this point, which gives the year 1876 as the time when the sanctuary shall be justified.

THE SABBATH-REST.

There remains to be considered one period more; that august Week of mundane history, already alluded to, of which each unit stretches over a thousand years. This grand era differs, indeed, from all those with which we have been occupied, in that it has no *direct* word of God on which to rest; and therefore it cannot strictly be called a prophetic period. But it is sanctioned by the belief of a very venerable antiquity, both Jewish and Christian; the former dating from before the birth of Christ; the latter including the earliest fathers, as Barnabas, Irenæus, Cyprian, Lactantius, Ambrose, &c. And, indirectly, it seems to have even inspired sanction; "for the apostle Paul's use of the word σαββατισμος, *sabbatism*, to designate the saints' expected glorious rest with Christ (Heb. iv. 9), may be not unreasonably considered as almost an apostolic recognition of the early and well-known Jewish opinion, that Messiah's kingdom of blessedness would occupy the seventh millennium of the world, agreeably with the type of the seventh day's sabbatism of rest after the six days of creation; especially seeing that it was Hebrew Christians whom he was then addressing, and that by them the word thus chosen could not but be almost necessarily associated,

alike from its etymology and its use, with some chronological septenary."*

The belief may be thus expressed:—The six days, during which the world was created, typically represent each a thousand years, during which its work-day life should last; and the seventh day, of God's rest, the seventh millennium, when Christ and his risen Saints shall reign over it.

Let us now examine this grand period, in order to ascertain whither it will land us in the range of time, the course of human history? Has it passed by, and disappointed the venerable expectation, by making no sign? Or is its termination still future? If the latter, how near, or how remote? And how does its close agree with that of the other periods which have just come under our examination? An inquiry this, surely of deep interest.

Happily, we approach it under far more auspicious conditions than our fathers could. For, as was just observed, our present times are now linked with those of the kings of Judah with a most reliable precision; and, for the rest of the grand Calendar, we need not go beyond the letter of the inspired Word.

The first year of Hezekiah is fixed (by the eclipse which caused the recession of the shadow in his fourteenth year) to B.C. 702. From this date to the first year of Saul are 375 years. The judicature of Samuel is an unknown period, which we will call x. The apostle Paul (Acts xiii. 20), gives 450 years as reaching from the division of the land to Samuel. And that this was 2559 years from the creation, may be easily computed from the Pentateuch; simply noting that—(1.) The Exodus was 430 years (Gal. iii. 17) after the call of Abram (Gen. xiii. 15); and (2.) That Abram was born (cf. Gen. xi. 32, and xii. 4, with Acts vii. 4) when Terah was 130 years old.

	YEARS.
From Adam to the division of the land,	2559
Thence to Samuel,	450
Samuel's judicature ?	x
From Saul to Hezekiah,	375
„ Hezekiah to Christ,	702
To the present year,	1871
	5957 + x.

Thus there have elapsed, since the creation, 5957 years *and the unknown period* occupied by Samuel between the death of

* Elliott's *Hor. Apoc.* iv. 256 (3d edition).

6,000
- 5,957
43
years until end

The present year 1871
+ 43
1914

Eli and the election of Saul. This interval we have no means of precisely determining; but the Scripture seems to settle it very nearly. Samuel was "a child" when Eli was "very old" (1 Sam. ii. 18, 22); he was still "a child" when Eli's "eyes began to wax dim that he could not see" (iii. 1, 2, 8); and that this word "child" must be understood literally, appears from the statement that after this he "grew" (iii. 19). Samuel, then, could scarcely have passed his vigorous manhood at the death of Eli: yet, at the election of Saul (xii. 2), he was "old and gray-headed;" and, some time before this, he had deputed his office to his sons, on account (viii. 1) of his own incapacity from old age.

Nearer than this we cannot go; but how notably this computation agrees in its results with those of the prophetic periods already evolved, may be left to the observation of our intelligent readers.

Now let us glance back for a moment, and review our results. Here are seven distinct periods, varying in range from 6000 to 360 years; some of them independent, others having complex relations with each other, the failure of one of which* would be quite fatal to it and to its fellows; every one of them having its starting-point and its termination (so far as this can be at present traced) marked by some momentous epoch, and momentous, too, in the most direct and manifest relation to the several events marked out for the periods; all of them periods of divine ordination, and their events not such as man might arbitrarily select from the ample page of history, but determined and severely limited beforehand by the Spirit of God. Yet their terminations, as with one concurrent harmonious voice, point to an era embraced by half a dozen years at most, either way, from the moment in which this page is written.

We must, however, avoid estimating this evidence more highly than it really deserves. The data, the premises, are divine, and therefore infallible: the conclusions are merely human inferences, and therefore liable to error. If the present epoch *should* (which may God avert!) pass by without the personal appearing of the Lord Jesus, or any grand crisis of prophetic accomplishment, we will not for a moment say that the truth of God

* For example. Suppose the bisection of the Seven Times had fallen at the beginning of the 5th century or at the end of the 7th, what could we have found to mark the commencement of the time, times and a half? Or, suppose the complete rise of the Papacy had been manifestly 50 or 100 years after its incipient rise (*i.e.*, suppose Phocas's grant and the concomitant events had been about A.D. 550 or 630), whereas the mature breaking of Israel had been 75 years after the incipient, the parallelism would have utterly failed. So with the other coincidences.

has failed; but only that, through our ignorance, we had misread his premonitions. In every department of human knowledge (mathematical science excepted) our nearest approach to absolute certainty is but a balancing of probabilities. God's Word is, indeed, Truth, without any admixture of error; but, in man's reception and application of this Truth, a thousand sources of possible error are at once opened.

Let us exemplify this. We cannot be *absolutely certain* that in the term "seven times," announced to Nebuchadnezzar, a typical meaning was couched. If there was, we are not *absolutely certain* that a "time" signifies 360 years. If it does, we are not *absolutely certain* that the divine commencement and termination are twofold; nor that the former was at the events indicated in 2 Kings xv. 29, and Isa. vii. 8. Yet, how high a probability attaches to all these assumptions we have endeavoured to show; and our readers must weigh it for themselves.

Again:—in marking the incipient rise of the Papacy by the favouring edict of the great lawgiver Justinian, it must not be overlooked that, in A.D. 378, an edict of Gratian and Valentinian II. had conferred on the Bishop of Rome the right of finally determining appeals throughout the whole Western Empire. And, in 445, an edict of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. had assigned the primacy to the See of Peter, and had forbidden anything to be attempted against the authority of that See. "For then, at length, the peace of the Churches shall everywhere be preserved, if the universe acknowledge its Ruler." This language approaches the force of that employed by Justinian, "Head of all the Churches;" yet it does not reach its blasphemous height, nor will these dates point to any events of importance, if 1260 years be computed from them either forward or backward. *Tò κατέχον*, moreover, had not yet been removed.

Once more:—if we examine the coincidences enumerated, *as if with a microscope*, we might say, that, since the events of 1870 (as the consummation of Papal blasphemy, the blotting out of the Temporal Power, and the crushing of the Eldest Son of the Church) exceed in apparent magnitude the events of 1868; so the events of 535, of 610, and of 1795, ought respectively to have exceeded those of 533, of 608, and of 1793, in like proportion; but, that they did, does not clearly appear from history, according to our power of estimating their importance. Yet the weight of the concurrence of these *groups of years* among themselves, and with those assigned to the beginning of the Seven Times, immensely preponderates over this slight discrepancy, which, too, may be only apparent.

There is such a thing as the credulity of scepticism; and he who obstinately refuses to accept as true any conclusion in which ingenuity can succeed in picking a hole, must remain all his life in painful doubt upon subjects of the gravest importance.

Before he quite dismisses the subject, the writer would fain present a loving *caveat* to his readers. God forbid that this article should be no more than an intellectual exercise, an attempt to solve a curious chronological problem, an arena for the display of mere mental acumen. The occupation of the *mind* about the Word of God, while the *conscience* is dormant, is a dangerous thing. Has not this subject a voice to the conscience, to the heart?

The coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him, is the great hope of the Church, ever vividly presented to her by the Holy Ghost and by Jesus himself. It is the very close connection of this most blessed consummation with the termini of the prophetic epochs herein discussed, that gives to them their absorbing interest. On it are intently bent the longing eyes of "all them that love his appearing." Whatever adds an iota of probability to the ever-expectant hope of beholding Jesus *quickly*, is precious. "My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning; I say, more than they that watch for the morning" (Ps. cxxx. 6). To see Him as He is, *to see Himself*, is our hope. He said to his sorrowing, orphaned disciples, "I will come again, and receive you *unto myself*, that *where I am*, ye may be also" (John xiv. 3). Glorious beyond our poor imagining as may be the lustre and magnificence of the Holy City which is to be our residence,—"*the Lamb* is the light thereof" (Rev. xxi. 23). We earnestly desire, by these investigations, to quicken the heart-hopes of his own; of those who know his love; who can say, in rapturous thanksgiving, "He loved *me*, and gave Himself for *me*;" to elicit the cry for his personal presence as their chief joy. What will it be to be *with Him!* What will it be to be *for ever with the Lord!* The least dim indication, the feeblest additional evidence, that He is near, ought to send a joyful thrill through our hearts. It ought; but, alas! it does not. The day we speak of is "the day of his espousals, the day of the gladness of his heart" (Song iii. 11; Rev. xix. 7), and He has abundantly shown how his own loving heart is set upon it. O that our cold hearts were so warmed with respondent love, that from the whole Church one strong irresistible cry should ascend, "Come, Lord Jesus!"

The New Testament, to one who reads with an opened eye and an obedient heart, abounds with instructions how we should regard the approaching Advent. Love towards it (2 Tim. iv. 8); ardent hope (Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; Col. iii. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 13-17; Rev. xxii. 12); earnest expectation (Phil. iii. 20; Titus ii. 13; Heb. x. 28; 2 Peter iii. 12, "hasting unto" it); godly fear, and jealousy of being disapproved (2 Cor. v. 10); patient endurance of trial (Heb. x. 36, 37; James v. 7); separation from the world, and looseness to entanglements (Luke xxi. 34); all holy conversation and godliness (2 Peter iii. 11); purity modelled on Jesus's purity (1 John iii. 3); finally, not a sentimental indifferentism which folds its hands and idly waits, but loving, active, self-denying service for the Church and the world while there is time (Matt. xxiv. 45; Mark xiii. 34; Luke xii. 35-48);—such are the conditions of mind and heart which the signs of the coming of Jesus should awaken and maintain.

O that writer and reader, "seeing that we look for such things, may be diligent that we may be found of Him in peace, without spot and blameless!" P. H. G.*

Art. IV.—NOTES ON EPHESIANS.

Chap. IV. 11. *And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.*

We have here an enumeration of the gifts spoken of in verse 8, "He gave gifts unto men," and alluded to in the previous verse, "Unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ." The announcement is emphatic. He—He—Himself gave, not only these offices, but the men who filled them. The offices were appointed by Christ, and those who filled them were His gift to His Church.

1. *Apostles.*—Not merely the twelve. But they and others who were recognised as specially set apart. Such were Paul himself, and Barnabas, and James, the Lord's brother. Their chief characteristics were,—a call from Christ himself, as Paul had; the power of working miracles; the superintendence of the Church in all lands; and, most prominent of all, their being able to bear an eye-witnessing testimony to Christ's resurrection.

* Without endorsing the prophetic views of the above article, we commend it to the study of our readers.—Editor.

2. *Prophets.*—"Not only in the more special sense, as Agabus, but in the more general one of preachers and expounders, who spoke under the immediate impulse and influence of the Holy Spirit, and were thus to be distinguished from the teacher."

3. *Evangelists.*—This word is not used here in the sense which it bears when applied to the writers of the four Gospels. It designates those who preached from place to place, under the direction of the apostles—itinerant preachers; as Philip, who was originally one of the deacons of the Church in Jerusalem, and Stephen, though his ministry was ended before he had an opportunity of exercising it beyond the city where he commenced it. "The term 'evangelist' is applied to those missionaries, who, like Philip and Timothy, travelled from place to place to bear the glad tidings of Christ to unbelieving nations or individuals. Hence it follows that the apostles were all evangelists, although there were also evangelists who were not apostles."

4. *Pastors and teachers.*—These were the stationary office-bearers who had charge of special congregations. Some think that these were names applied indifferently to the same class. It seems more probable that, although both were stationary officers, they differed in their functions. The pastors or shepherds (bishops), whilst they might be also teachers, for the bishop's office is said to be "to feed the flock," seem to have had the care or charge of—that is, administrative powers and authority over—the special flock committed to them. The others, again, were distinguished by special aptitude for teaching, apart from any office of rule or authority. Faussett remarks on the whole of these classes:—"As the apostles, prophets, and evangelists were special ministers, so pastors and teachers are the ordinary ministers of a flock, including probably superintending bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Evangelists were itinerant missionary preachers, as Philip the deacon; pastors and teachers were stationary. The evangelist founded the Church, the teacher built it up in the faith, speaking sometimes in the Spirit, at other times from his own resources. The pastor had the outward rule and guidance of the Church—the bishop; as kings are called shepherds. As to revelation, the evangelist testified infallibly as of the past; the prophet also of the future. . . . No one church polity, as permanently unalterable, is laid down in the New Testament. . . . In the New Testament the absence of minute directions for church government and ceremonies shows that a fixed model was not designed: the general rule is obligatory, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.'"

The Great Pyramid!

Scanned

THE QUARTERLY
JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

OCTOBER 1869.

Art. I.—EIGHTY YEARS AGO!

WHAT SINCE—WHAT NEXT—WHAT LAST—WHAT NOW ?

Eighty years takes us back to the year of the outbreak of the first French Revolution. On May 5, 1789, "the States-General" met at Versailles, and then began that rush of events which made the world stand aghast; events the final end of which is yet to come. Eighty years do not seem very long to look back upon, especially to those who have been conversant with history and its immense periods. Some persons are now living who were in existence when the first shocks of the great earthquake referred to sent a thrill of horror through millions of hearts. A very few can recollect the stirring scenes which quickly followed. There are many of us who have conversed with those who lived through this period, who followed Wellington through his wonderful Spanish campaign, or who fought under Nelson. Let us now look back on this birth-year of change, war, and revolution, and then look downward from it through the fourscore years which have since flitted by; and ask, as we stand amidst the results of these revolutions and wars, 'What will be the end of these wonders?' what that end will usher in? and what is our present duty?"

Though towards the close of last century the kings of Europe seemed to sit secure upon their thrones, and their nobles revelled in pride and luxury,—though tens of thousands of priests went regularly through their heartless ceremonies,—though all these parties saw no danger, and desired no alteration for the better,—yet signs of change and warnings of the coming storm were

BRITISH MUSEUM

all the great spirits of the Reformation, had been the unconscious friends of Israel; and when the sentiment of respect for private judgment in affairs of faith had entered deeply into men's minds, a habit of toleration followed in its wake, of which the Hebrew found his share.

The Puritans were warm admirers of the Jews. They talked Old Testament. They called their sons David and Abner, their daughters Miriam and Hephzebah. They regarded the Commonwealth as a new Israel, and Cromwell as a modern Joshua. Some of the foreign Jews partook of these fancies. They thought the Lord Protector might prove to be their Messias, and they sent a deputation to England to make strict inquiry into Cromwell's pedigree, expecting to find in his ancestry some trace of Hebrew blood. Under his Protectorate they hoped to come back to their ancient English homes.

Cromwell sat in his chair of state, with the open Bible before him, and with a petition from a learned Jew in his hand. It was a very adroit petition, and the writer of it was a very ingenious man. The petition began, in its queer English, referring to the words of Daniel—"Thou that removest kings and settest up kings,"—facts which he hinted were allowed,—"to the end the living might know that the Highest hath dominion in man's kingdom and giveth the same to whom He pleases." It went on to say that no man becomes a governor of men unless he be first called to that office by God. It then proceeded to show that no ruler of men had ever been stable in his seat of power who was inimical to the holy race; and cited in proof of this strong assertion the cases of Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, Epiphanius, and Pompey. The paper went on to say that no country which favoured that race had ever failed to flourish, though it refrained from citing the examples of his second proposition. Lastly, it prayed the Lord Protector to repeal the laws, passed under the kings, against the Jews, and to permit a synagogue to be built in London.

The author of this petition was Manasseh-ben-Israel, a Jew of Portuguese descent, then living in Amsterdam—a man of fine culture and unquestionable piety. English ambassadors had been received in the Dutch capital, not only by the government, but by the churches. Not the least eager to hail the new Commonwealth were the Hebrew merchants, and a grand reception was accorded to her ministers in the synagogue. Manasseh took advantage of this visit to urge upon Cromwell the recall of his people from their long exile.

Cromwell favoured the petition. The Lord Chief-Justice and the Lord Chief-Baron reported against maintaining the old statute of exclusion. The Lord Mayor and Sheriff declared that the city was willing to receive the Jews as brethren. But the old enemies of the Jews were still strong. The clergy, even the Puritan clergy, could not see their way to such liberal concessions as the lawyers and citizens were prepared to make. To the divines, a Jew was a man of a stiff-necked race, who had rejected the true Messiah and put the Son of God to a shameful death. Owen, Cradock, and their brethren, turned over the leaves of prophecy. Manasseh had very skilfully fallen in with Puritan ways of thought; hinting that the Judgment was at hand, and the day of final reconciliation nigh. Cromwell, struck by this suggestion, urged the divines to adopt a healing policy; but the preachers held to the doctrine that the Jews were a God-abandoned people, unfit for association with Christian men. Cromwell's eloquence was highly praised; and the subject being one which he knew, he probably spoke beyond his usual style; but neither Glynn's law nor Cromwell's eloquence availed in presence of these hot divines. The clergy stood out; and even after Hugh Peters and two other advocates of Manasseh's scheme were added to the conference, the clergy were obstinate and powerful enough to defeat Cromwell's plan.

But the Lord Protector was a law unto himself. If a regular act could not

be obtained, empowering the Jews to settle in England once again, not as "king's men," but as citizens and equals, men with legal rights, he could and would permit them to come in as "Protector's men." In that quality a few of them came back from Amsterdam and Leyden. Under Cromwell, they had no persecution to fear and no exactions to resist. They came back on suffrance only; but they soon established a character in London which made them many friends. In a few years, opinion underwent a change; the clergy lost their power; the old abominable laws were all repealed; and the Jew, who had ventured to come home as a "Protector's man," became a peaceable and prosperous citizen of the realm.

Among the Jews themselves, Cromwell is regarded as the man to whom, under God, they are chiefly indebted for their happy return to a country which had cast them out for 400 years. But Cromwell might never have called that conference in the Long Gallery of Whitehall had he not been urged by Manasseh-ben-Israel, the pious and able Portuguese Jew; a copy of whose rather scarce Petition to His Highness the Lord Protector has been reprinted at Melbourne, in Australia,—a city which is more populous than Jerusalem, and which is built on a continent of which Manasseh never heard the name.*

Extracts.

The Great Pyramid.

THE GREATEST ARCHITECTURAL WONDER ON EARTH.

It was in the time of Alexander the Great, more than three hundred years before Christ, that the Greeks began their proverb about "the seven wonders of the world." These were—the Pyramids of Egypt, the walls and hanging gardens of Babylon, the temple of Diana at Ephesus, the statue of the Olympian Jupiter by Phidias, the mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the Colossus of Rhodes, and the Pharos of Alexandria. All these have disappeared except the first—the Pyramids; and of these, all are falling into ruins but one, the chief of them all, the greatest and oldest, known as the Great Pyramid of Gizeh, above Cairo, near the Nile.

It has been only within the past few years that any sort of rational appreciation of this Pyramid has found place in the minds and knowledge of men. Though it is the oldest of the standing works of man, and the largest and loftiest building, so far as we know, that ever existed upon the globe, the world has, until lately, known very little about it. Recent discoveries and verifications concerning it, by John Taylor, C. Piazza Smyth, St John Vincent Day, and William Petrie—all within the last ten years—show it to be, at this moment, the most wonderful thing now in existence on the face of the earth, next to the Bible itself.

It is situated on that peculiar isthmus between Africa and Asia,

* The above interesting review is from the *Athenæum.*

across which lies the great highway of trade from Europe and America to India, China, Australia, and Japan, near where Alexander located the grand commercial depot of the ancient world, and where France is now opening a ship canal, which is to unite the five great divisions of the globe. It stands on the thirtieth parallel of latitude, with an equal amount of terrestrial semi-surface to the north and south of it. Its four sides face the four cardinal points of the compass, with more exactness than can be determined by the compass itself, without the aid of calculation. It is "in the midst of the land of Egypt, and at the border thereof" (Isa. xix. 19), midway between the northern and southern Egypt, and on the border of the Great Desert on the west, and of the fertile plain of the Nile on the east. The solid rock has been cut away to an exact level for its base. It is built of dressed and systematically-adjusted limestone; and its most finished parts are of the finest granite, carried from quarries five hundred miles distant. It consists of 70,000,000 cubic feet of built masonry, the stones of which are seldom less than three or four feet thick, seven or eight long, and as many wide. It covers more than twelve acres of surface. Its height is 486 feet, and its circumference 3054 feet. It is a perfect square in its base, the four corners being set in sockets accurately cut into the rock to receive its four foundation-stones. It has four equal sides terminating in a point at the top. The whole body of the structure was originally cased with polished marble from Mokattam, though most of this casing has been torn out to build Cairo. The structure is solid masonry throughout. It has but one narrow passage, which pierces it on the north side, directly on the plane of the meridian. The opening is considerably up in the masonry, and runs at an angle pointing outward to the then Pole Star. A branch from this passage leads up to two small chambers in the centre of the solid mass. The solid work is two thousand times more than the space occupied by all the known passages, chambers, or openings in it. The upper chamber has been called the King's, and the lower and smaller the Queen's chamber. One solitary piece of furniture is all that the vast edifice contains, or is ever known to have contained. It was put in when the edifice was in course of construction, and cannot be removed. It is an ark of dark porphyry or granite, a chest or lidless coffer, of exquisite finish, cut in one piece from some one of the Sinaitic mountains.

Hitherto, there has been much wild conjecture in regard to the date at which this mountain of masonry was built. Most persons are familiar with the enormous, but long since exploded figures, in which the French *savans* set forth the dates of the zodiacs and Pyramids of Egypt. But there have been professed Christians, who have done very little better. Chevalier Bunson, in his work on "Egypt's Place in History," has put down the date of the Great Pyramid as 3280 years before Christ. Brugsch and Lepsius have put it down as between 3100 and 3500 years before Christ. And the Jew, Renan, has recently asserted that the Great Pyramid dates back at least 4500 years before our era. But all these dates are now completely and for ever negatived by the Pyramid itself.

Modern astronomy has clearly demonstrated the ongoing of a great siderial cycle, known as the grand year of the Pleiades, or the precessional cycle, consisting of 25,868 solar years. Haliburton has deduced the same from the traditions of very many peoples and tongues. So great a period exceeds, by tens of thousands of years, the entire historic period of our world. There can, therefore, be no uncertainty or confusion in determining the exact date of any given observation of the relative places of the stars which mark this cycle. We know precisely how they stand to-day, as certainly as we can read the indications of the hands on the face of a clock. By calculating backwards, we know with equal certainty how they stood in any year since man was placed upon the earth. And any recorded observation of them, no matter when taken, must, therefore, contain in it the unmistakable evidence of the precise year in which it was made.

Now, it so turns out, that the Great Pyramid memorialises, in the angles of its passages and general astronomical character, a distinct, evident, and accurate observation of the relative places of certain stars which mark this grand cycle, the exact length of which is also given in the diagonals of its base. From these rocky memorials it can, therefore, be definitely ascertained when that observation was taken, and so when the Great Pyramid was built, which was 800 years before Moses, and just 2170 years before the birth of Christ. So remarkable, also, were the relative positions of the stars in this cycle in that year, as to realise a very noticeable fact in the configuration of the heavens.

In the year 2170 B.C., and only then, the Pleiades and the then Pole Star (*a* Draconis) were, at midnight in October, exactly opposite each other, and both were on the meridian together, one below and the other above the pole. The arrangements of the Pyramid have this state of the heavens built into them, astronomically correct as then existing. Sir John Herschel, thirty years ago, thus fixed upon the date of the Pyramid, as embodied unmistakably in itself; and further knowledge of the Pyramid has now greatly accumulated the evidence to the same effect. The same relative positions of these stars cannot recur, from that time, for 25,868 years, which will be more than 20,000 years hence. And, at the rate of an inch for a year, the number of years in the whole precessional cycle is built into the sum of the two diagonals of the base of this great pillar.

We thus have at least *one* solid and ascertained date in ancient chronology, settled by the Great Pyramid, and settled to the everlasting confusion of the atheistic *savans* of France, as well as those professedly Christian writers who have done very little better in their teachings about the fabulous antiquity of Egyptian history and civilisation. This, certainly, is something gained, and something of no mean consequence for the confirmation of faith in the Biblical representations of the history of man.

The *mathematical* principles embodied in this wonderful structure are very remarkable. Not only is its base an exact square, but its four sides incline toward its central axis at equal angles of 51 degrees 51 minutes and 14.3 seconds. Its height is thence to twice its base-breadth, as the diameter to the circumference of a circle; that is to say, the height bears to the four sides of the base the same ratio that the radius bears to the circumference, though it has not been long since modern science first determined this ratio of diameter to circumference. This Great Pyramid thus stands up in its whole shape, a type and memorial of *a squaring of the circle*, performed ages and ages before the question was ever heard of amongst the schools of philosophy or the written records of mathematical investigation.

A hebdomal system also appears in this greatest and oldest of human structures. The mean proportion of the entrance-passage is one-seventh of the mean height of the grand gallery leading to the King's chamber. The side walls of this gallery are marked with seven overlappings of the stones in each. The horizontal passage-way, leading off from the lower entrance point of the grand gallery and conducting to the Queen's chamber, is, in its entire length, just seven times the distance from a marked section starting from the north wall. This passage, at its southern end, has a step of suddenly increased depth, which is one-seventh of the whole passage—a nobler and higher unit filling out a scale of seven. The Queen's chamber itself is seven-sided, like a geometrical figure, or a natural crystallisation—four walls, two ceilings, and one floor. Thus there is a passage-way of sevens, to a perfectly finished room of sevens.

The *astronomical* intelligence embodied in this Great Pyramid is equally wonderful. It is not only truly oriented, as above stated; that is, placed with its four sides exactly facing the four quarters of the heavens, but each side of the base of the Pyramid measures 365 cubits—the number of days in the year—with a slight addition in each of $\frac{1}{4}$th, which, together, makes up for the nearly six hours additional, which in four years require one day to be added, as in "leap year." The Pyramid thus exhibits the precise number of times and parts of a time that the globe turns on its axis during its annual circuit round the sun. Each of these cubits of 25 inches, well ascertained as the sacred cubit of Moses, is a ten-millionth part of the polar semi-axis of the globe. The height of the Pyramid, multiplied by ten to the ninth power, gives the mean distance of the earth from the sun; that is, a little more than 92,000,000 miles, which is almost precisely what astronomers have most recently calculated, and most probably more accurate than our modern science, which still labours under some uncertainty on this point. The daily progress of the globe round the sun, is the grandly even quantity, in decimal arithmetic, of $10^{7 \times 4}$ of the Pyramid inches. The weight of the Pyramid, upon close calculation, is evenly $\frac{1}{10}{}^{23}$ of the weight of the globe. The situation of the Pyramid on the 30th degree of latitude, and at a height of about 2600 inches above the sea-level, its chief chamber, containing the coffer, gives, by means of two ventilating tubes, the mean temperature of the whole surface of the habitable earth = 68 degrees, Fahrenheit, or one-fifth of the space between the boiling and freezing points of water, measured from the latter.

A Churchman's Wardrobe.

The following is an inventory of the garments needed by a Churchman to enable him to worship in simplicity and godly sincerity. The writer seems to have had a fervent ambition to reach the summit of ritualistic perfection at a bound. He must have appeared well in his toggery. The following is the account of his wardrobe:—

"I procured an alb, chasuble, amice, girdle, maniple, dalmatic, tunic gremial, chirothecae, aspergillum, aspersorium, manicula, particle, benatura, stock, aumbrey, pome, thurible, chalice, navicula, the Directorum Angelicanum, and the priest's prayer-book, together with a multitude of utensils such as you Christians would not understand if I named them."

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.

SIR,—In the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, unanimity of opinion on matters of detail cannot reasonably be expected, even amongst those who, in a general way, are pretty well agreed.

A paper, then, such as that subjoined, which enters into the minutiæ of things to come in broad outline in Holy Scripture—as in some points, no doubt, mistaken—is sure to find opponents and to provoke dissent. Such dissent, however, I would most earnestly invite, being fully assured that discussion, when carried on in the spirit of Christian brotherhood, is the very highway to truth.

JOHN R. ECHLIN,
Author of "The Sure Word of Prophecy."

Rokeby, Lisburn, Ireland.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF PROPHETICAL INTERPRETATION.

There are certain corollaries deducible, as I think, from the inspired Word, which may well be regarded as of the nature stated in the heading to this paper, and which, when duly established, will lead us safely on, and enable us easily and readily to fill up the outline they sketch in. Of this sort I would enumerate *five*, proceeding then to vindicate them on scriptural grounds.

The corollaries to which I refer are these:—

1*st*, That our Lord's Second Advent will be *pre*-millennial.

2*dly*, That the duration of "the day of the Lord" spoken of by St Peter 2d Ep. iii.), will be a thousand years—in other words, it will be co-extensive with the millenium.